## COMMAND INSPECTION PROGRAM

## XCEPTIONS DOCUMENT

age 1 of 2

Command:	Division:	Chapter 6. Grant Mngmt
Auburn	valley Division	Grant lyingmt
Inspected by:		Date: 12/7/2009
Sgt. Doug M	ıllıgan	12/1/2009

70.90						
number of the inspection in the Chapter shall be routed to and its due date. This	Inspection docume	Check appropriate boxes as necessary, or for number. Under "Forward to:" enter the neent shall be utilized to document innovative proction plans. A CHP 51 Memorandum may be	actices, suggestions for statewide			
TYPE OF INSPECTION  ☐ Division Level ☐ Command Level ☐ Executive Office Level		Total hours expended on the inspection: 4.5	☐ Corrective Action Plan Included ☐ Attachments Included			
Follow-up Required:  ☐ Yes ⊠ No	Forwa	, /				
Chapter Inspection:						
Auburn Area has been innova CHP and allied agencies, their	Inspector's Comments Regarding Innovative Practices:  Auburn Area has been innovative in their grant proposals. Because of their inclusion of neighboring CHP and allied agencies, their speed grant was the only one approved by the Office of Traffic Safety.					
Command Suggestions for Sone.	tatewic	de Improvement:				
Inspector's Findings: Current grants are on schedul						
Commander's Response: 🗵	Concu	r or   Do Not Concur (Do Not Conc	cur shall document basis for response)			
Inspector's Comments: Shall etc.)	address	non concurrence by commander (e.g., f	indings revised, findings unchanged,			

# COMMAND INSPECTION PROGRAM XCEPTIONS DOCUMENT

'age 2 of 2

		·
Command:	Division:	Chapter:
Auburn	Valley Division	6: Grant Mngmt
Inspected by:		Date:
Sgt. Doug Milligan		12/7/2009

<u>많다면 하루 하는데 보면 경우로 보는데 그는데 하면 하면 한국 관련 관련을 받는데 하면 하면 하면 하는데 하는데 하면 하는데 하는데 하는데 하는데 하는데 하는데 하는데 하는데 하는데 하는데</u>	3
Required Action	
[10] [16] [12] [10] [10] [10] [10] [10] [10] [10] [10	
Corrective Action Plan/Timeline	

Employee would like to discuss this report with the reviewer.  (See HPM 9.1, Chapter 8 for appeal procedures.)	COMMANDER'S SIGNATURE  WWW.	12/7/09
	INSPECTOR'S SIGNATURE	12/1/2009
Reviewer discussed this report with	REVIEWER'S SIGNATURE)	12/23 bg

Page

TATE OF CALIFORNIA
.PARTMENT OF CALIFORNIA HIGHWAY PATROL

## COMMAND INSPECTION PROGRAM INSPECTION CHECKLIST

Chapter 6 Command Grant Management

Command: Auburn Area	Division: Valley Division	Number:
Evaluated by: Sgt. Doug Millig	an	Date: 12/7/2009
Assisted by: Shelley Daly		Date: 12/7/2009

INSTRUCTIONS: Answer individual items with "Yes" or "No" answers, or fill in the blanks as indicated. Any discrepancies with policy, applicable legal statues, or deficiencies noted in the inspections shall be commented on via the "Remarks" section. Additionally, such discrepancies and/or deficiencies shall be documented on an Exceptions Document and addressed to the next level of command. Furthermore, the Exceptions Document shall include any follow-up and/or corrective action(s) taken. If this form is used as a Follow-up Inspection, the "Follow-up Inspection" box shall be marked and only deficient items need to be re-inspected.								
TYPE OF	FINSPECTION		Lead Inspe	ector's Signatu	ıre:			
☐ Divi	sion Level	□ Command Level	-1	.11	A)	·		
☐ Exe	cutive Office Level	☐ Voluntary Self-Inspection		. M.				
Fo	llow-up Required:	Follow-up Inspection	Commande	er's Signature			Date:	
	Yes No	in anomal map map and	710	Donn	u		12/7/2009	
•	plicable policy, refer to							
		ecked, the "Remarks" section	shall be ut	ilized for ex	<u>kplanation</u>			
1.		s proposing or has submitted	☐ Yes	□No	⊠ N/A	Remarks:		
		unding agency other than the OTS) that appears to focus						
	on traffic safety goals cle	early within the jurisdiction of						
	the Department, did the appropriate assistant co					:		
2.	Has OTS grant funding,	through the Highway Safety	[] V	- N-	∇Ζ ΝΙ/Λ	Domanica		
		affic safety-related activities acting inventories, need and	Yes	□No	⊠ N/A	Remarks:		
	engineering studies, sys implementations?	tem development or program						
3.	Has the command sough	nt grant funding to assist with	⊠ Yes	M No	□ N/A	Damarka		
	identified by the Nationa	I with the priority programs I Highway Traffic Safety	⊠ res	☐ No	□ N/A	Remarks:		
	Administration?							
4.		ured grant funds are not tother programs or used for	⊠ Yes	□No	□ N/A	Remarks:		
	non-reimbursable overtir	ne expenditures?	23 103			TCHIGHTO.		
5.	Are concept papers rega	ording grant funding nels to Grants Management	⊠ Yes	□No	□ N/A	Remarks:		
	Unit (GMU)?	-	K7 1 C3		11/7	TORIQINS.		
6.	Was GMU contacted to	determine the current sed for grant projects when	⊠ Yes	□No	□ N/A	Remarks:		
ı	preparing concept paper		<u> </u>	□ :40		s terraines.		

## OMMAND INSPECTION PROGRAM INSPECTION CHECKLIST

Chapter 6 Command Grant Management

7	Is supporting documentation of consent and acceptance (of the work, goods, or services provided by the state on behalf of a local government agency as required by 23 Code of Federal Regulations Part 1250) being submitted to OTS for all grant projects coded as "for local benefit"?	⊠ Yes	□No	□ N/A	Remarks:
8	revisions, and claim invoices signed by the Project Director, or designated alternate?	⊠ Yes	□No	□ N/A	Remarks: Handled by GMU
S	availability of grant funds or other contacts with grant funding agencies coordinated/processed through GMU?	⊠ Yes	☐ No	□ N/A	Remarks:
	<ol> <li>Are all expenditures of grant funds approved by GMU prior to entering into any obligations, with the exception of personnel costs?</li> </ol>	⊠ Yes	□ No	□ N/A	Remarks: New REDS requisition program mandates GMU approval
	<ol> <li>Are quarterly progress reports forwarded though channels to GMU in accordance with the instructions contained in the associated project MOU?</li> </ol>	⊠ Yes	☐ No	□ N/A	Remarks:
1	<ol><li>Are all requirements of the grant agreement and MOU being met?</li></ol>	⊠ Yes	□No	□ N/A	Remarks: All goals on track for completion for all existing grants
1	3. Is a final project report being prepared in accordance with the funding agency and departmental requirements upon the termination of the grant project?	☐ Yes	□No	⊠ N/A	Remarks: Current FAST Grant requires GMU to complete the final report.
1	4. Does every invoice associated with a grant funded project contain the project number and name?	☐ Yes	□No	⊠ N/A	Remarks: No current invoices for existing grant.
1	<ol> <li>Are all purchases of grant-funded equipment acquired under an OTS grant exceeding a unit cost of \$5,000 being documented on an Equipment Report, Form OTS-25?</li> </ol>	☐ Yes	□No	⊠ N/A	Remarks: No allowable purchases exceeding \$5,000.00
1	6. Has grant funded equipment been inspected to ensure it is being utilized in accordance with the respective grant agreement?	⊠ Yes	□No	□ N/A	Remarks: Previously acquired grant funded equipment used as intended
4.	<ul> <li>7. Are applications for federal funds in accordance with Government Code Section 13326 including obtaining approval from the Department of Finance and/or the Governor's office prior to submission to the appropriate federal authority?</li> <li>This would include any of the following:         <ul> <li>Applications for federal funds which are not included in the budget approved by the Governor.</li> <li>Applications for federal funds which exceed the amount specified in the budget.</li> </ul> </li> </ul>	⊠ Yes	□ No	□ N/A	Remarks: Responsibility of GMU

## COMMAND INSPECTION PROGRAM INSPECTION CHECKLIST

Chapter 6 Command Grant Management

	18. Is a federal Standard Form 424, Application for Federal Assistance, filed with the State Clearinghouse for all approved unbudgeted grant requests received by the Department of Finance?	☐ Yes	☐ No	⊠ N/A	Remarks:
-	19. Has any request for unanticipated federal funds met the criteria for legislative notification set forth in Control Section 28.00 of the annual Budget Act?	☐ Yes	□No	⊠ N/A	Remarks:
	20. Are grant funds being used for their intended purpose?	⊠ Yes	☐ No	□ N/A	Remarks:
	21. Are grant applications related to the Motor Carrier Safety Assistance Program (MCSAP) being routed through the Commercial Vehicle Section before they are submitted to the funding agency?	☐ Yes	□No	⊠ N/A	Remarks:
	22. Are grant applications related to the Homeland Security Grant Program being routed through the Emergency Operations Section before they are submitted to the funding agency?	☐ Yes	□No	⊠ N/A	Remarks:
•	uestions 23 through 26 pertain to the Grants Managemen	it Unit			
	23. Has GMU prepared an annual Management Memorandum to be disseminated to all commanders soliciting participation in the Department's Highway Safety Program?	☐ Yes	□ No	□ N/A	Remarks:
	24. Did GMU send the concept paper as an attachment to a memorandum through the Planning and Analysis Division to Assistant Commissioner, Field, and Assistant Commissioner, Staff, and their Executive Assistants?	☐ Yes	□No	□ N/A	Remarks:
	25. Did GMU route copies of the Draft Grant Agreement using the CHP Form 60, Staff Summary Statement, to all commands with responsibility for or that have an interest in the project?	☐ Yes	□No	□ N/A	Remarks:
••••	26. Was a Memorandum of Understanding between involved commands outlining the responsibilities of each command prepared and distributed by GMU?	☐ Yes	□No	□ N/A	Remarks:

### COMMAND INSPECTION PROGRAM **"XCEPTIONS DOCUMENT**

Inspected by: Sgt. Doug Milligan

Division:

Valley

Command:

Auburn

Chapter; 6 Date: 12/17/2009

age 1 of 2

		37		
INSTRUCTIONS: This document shall be number of the inspection in the Chapter shall be routed to and its due date. This improvement, identified deficiencies, co	Inspecti docum	on number. Under "Forw ent shall be utilized to do	ard to:" enter the ne cument innovative pr	ill in the blanks as indicated. Enter the chapter xt level of command where the document ractices, suggestions for statewide e used if additional space is required.
TYPE OF INSPECTION  Division Level  Command I	_evel	Total hours expended on the inspection:		Corrective Action Plan Included
Executive Office Level		4.5		Attachments Included
Follow-up Required:	Forwa	rd to:		
☐ Yes	Due D	ate:		
Chapter Inspection:				
Inspector's Comments Regar	dina l	anovative Practices		
Auburn Area has created an o Report and is also used in the also used to track non-reimburn command Suggestions for St	alloca rsable	tion of voluntary re overtime expenditu	imbursable ove	verifying the Monthly Attendance rtime allocations. This system is analysis.
Inspector's Findings:				
Area is adhering to policy and overtime expenditures.	monito	ors all overtime to n	ninimize non es	sential non reimbursable
Commander's Response:	Concu	r or 🗌 Do Not Con	cur (Do Not Conc	ur shall document basis for response)
Inspector's Comments: Shall a	ddress	non concurrence by co	ommander (e.g., fir	ndings revised, findings unchanged,
)				

### COMMAND INSPECTION PROGRAM

"XCEPTIONS DOCUMENT

'age 2 of 2

Command:	Division:	Chapter:
Auburn	Valley	6
Inspected by:		Date:
Sgt. Doug M	illigan	12/17/2009

			6 T T T T T	
Required Action				
			(A)	$\Sigma^{*} = \Sigma^{*}$
Corrective Action	Plan/Timeline	 		 · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · ·

Employee would like to discuss this report with the reviewer.  (See HPM 9.1, Chapter 8 for appeal procedures.)	COMMANDER'S SIGNATURE  WWW DOWN-	12/17/09
	INSPECTOR'S SIGNATURE  Millign	12-17-09
Reviewer discussed this report with employee Concur Do not concur	REVIEWER'S SIGNATURE	12/23 to 3

## COMMAND INSPECTION PROGRAM INSPECTION CHECKLIST

Chapter 6 Command Overtime

Command: Auburn	Division: Valley	Number:
Evaluated by: Sgt. Doug Milligan		Date: 12/17/2009
Assisted by: Shelley Daly		Date: 12/17/2009

applicat discrepa Furtherr	ole legal statues, or deficienc ancies and/or deficiencies sh more, the Exceptions Docum	l items with "Yes" or "No" answer ies noted in the inspections shall all be documented on an Except ent shall include any follow-up ar " box shall be marked and only o	be comment ions Documend/or correc	nted on via t ent and add tive action(s	he "Remar lressed to t a) taken. If	ks" section. Ac he next level o this form is use	dditionally, such f command.
TYPE OF	INSPECTION		Lead Inspe	ector's Signat	ure:		
		⊠ Command Level		,	Λ		
	cutive Office Level	☐ Voluntary Self-Inspection		Mi	llig	<u> </u>	
	llow-up Required:	Voluntary Sen-Inspection	Commander's Signature: Date:			Date:	
	Yes ⊠ No	Follow-up Inspection	w Down 12/17/00				12/17/09
HPM 4							
		ecked, the "Remarks" section	shall be ut	ilized for e	xplanation	1.554-51.55	
1.	Is the hiring company/ag- overtime being held resp minimum of four hours of uniformed employee, reg service/detail?	onsible for paying a overtime per CHP	⊠ Yes	□ No	□ N/A	Remarks:	
2.	to each CHP uniformed e notification is made 24 ho scheduled detail and the		⊠ Yes	□ No	□ N/A	Remarks:	
3.	Are reimbursable special	project codes being used d with reimbursable special	⊠ Yes	□No	□ N/A	Remarks: Current FAST Code: 456	Grant Special
4.	overtime hours are not re	ng nonuniformed personnel flected on the Report of bursable Special Projects?	⊠ Yes	☐ No	□ N/A	Remarks;	
	than Bargaining Unit 7, w compensated time off for regular work shift time?	med for an employee, other hile on vacation or hours worked during their	⊠ Yes	□ No	□ N/A	Remarks: Not permitted with the current automated CHP 415 system.	
6.	Is "RDO" being written in CHP 415, Daly Field Rec a regular day off?	the "Notes" section of the ord, for overtime worked on	⊠ Yes	□ No	□ N/A	Remarks: Current Automated 415 system requires a supplemental 415 .	
	Is there a CHP 90, Repor Civil Action, completed fo when overtime is associated	r each officer or sergeant	⊠ Yes	☐ No	□ N/A	Remarks:	

# COMMAND INSPECTION PROGRAM INSPECTION CHECKLIST

Chapter 6 Command Overtime

1	8 Do the CHP 415s with overtime indicate the				
	employee's lunch period or indicate "None" if the employee worked through their lunch break?	☐ Yes	□No	⊠ N/A	Remarks: Not required
	9. Did the supervisor sign the CHP 415s approving the overtime?	⊠ Yes	□ No	□ N/A	Remarks: Required by Automated 415 system.
	10. Are claimed overtime meals related to overtime worked within 50 miles of the employee's headquarters?	☐ Yes	⊠ No	□ N/A	Remarks:
	11. If overtime is incurred by a peer support counselor, is the name of the employee to whom support was provided excluded from the CHP 415 of the counselor?	⊠ Yes	□ No	□ N/A	Remarks:
	12. Is the "Notes" section on side two of the CHP 415 used to explain any overtime listed on side one of the CHP 415?	⊠ Yes	□No	□ N/A	Remarks:
_	Are employee's Compensated Time Off hours maintained within reasonable balances?	⊠ Yes	□No	□ N/A	Remarks:
	14. Is the commander ensuring employees are not incurring overtime due to working over the allotted number of hours for any given Fair Labor Standards Act (FLSA) period?	⊠ Yes	□No	□ N/A	Remarks:
	15. Is the commander ensuring uniformed employees are not working voluntary overtime which results in them working more than 16.5 hours in a 24 hour period?	⊠ Yes	□ No	□ N/A	Remarks: SOP requires Commander's approval IF 16.5 hours are to be exceeded.
	16. Do the CHP 415 total overtime hours agree with the Monthly Attendance Report (MAR)?	⊠ Yes	□No	□ N/A	Remarks:
	Are the MARs retained for at least three years and contain the commander's signature?	⊠ Yes	□No	□ N/A	Remarks: